REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF Mingo, TPM 20829

October 19, 2006

I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE – Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?						
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ⊠			
Discussion:						
boundaries of the of any off-site impr	Multiple Spe rovements d ge Scrub Or	cies Conserva o not contain h dinance. Thei	ovements are located outside of the ation Program, the project site and locations habitats subject to the Habitat Loss refore, conformance to the Habitat Loss gs is not required.			
<u>II. MSCP/BMO</u> - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?						
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT			
Discussion:						
located outside of	the boundar	ies of the Mult he Multiple Sp	vements related to the proposed project are iple Species Conservation Program. ecies Conservation Program and the ed.			
III. GROUNDWAT the San Diego Co			he project comply with the requirements of ce?			
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ☑			
Discussion:						

The project will obtain its water supply from the Fallbrook Public Utility District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use

any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Article IV, Sections 1 & 2) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5)?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Section 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT ⊠
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway/floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it located near any watercourse which is plotted on any official County floodway/floodplain map.

Steep Slopes:

The project site contains no steep slope lands as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance.

Sensitive Habitats:

No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site visit conducted by Greg Krzys on May 14, 2004. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

The County of San Diego staff archaeologist/historian has analyzed records, and determined there are no archaeological/ historical sites.

- 3 -

Discussion:

MINGO TPM 20829

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Without additional measures, the proposal could expose people to potentially significant traffic noise levels (i.e., in excess of the County Noise Element exterior standard of 60 decibels CNEL). A Noise Protection Easement is required to implement mitigation measures including a six-foot sound attenuation barrier, dual pane windows, and other structural elements in the final building plans to reduce the noise impacts to the applicable limits: A feasible sound attenuation barrier (Exhibit 1) was identified in the Noise Impact Analysis prepared by Giroux and Associates dated January 16, 2006.

Other transportation (railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.